

## **REMARKS**

In view of the following remarks, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

### **I. Telephone Interview**

Initially, the Applicants would like to thank Examiner Zunig for conducting the telephone interview on October 22, 2009.

During the telephone interview the Examiner agreed that paragraphs [0127] and [0179] and Fig. 2 of Nakano, as relied upon in the Office Action of July 7, 2009, fail to disclose or suggest the limitations of the claimed index information storage unit and index information output unit.

However, during the interview the Examiner identified new portions (see Fig. 8 and paragraph [0136]) of Nakano and took the position that these new portions of Nakano disclose the limitations of the claimed index information storage unit and index information output unit. Specifically, the Examiner took the position that Fig. 8 and paragraph [0136] of Nakano teach that device key identification information corresponds directly to a device key. The Examiner indicated that based on this one-to-one correspondence the device key identification information indicates the device key. Moreover, the Examiner stated that paragraph [0226] of Nakano discloses that the device key, the device key information and ID information are all output to the user apparatus. Further, the Examiner expressed that this disclosure by Nakano suggests the limitations of the index information storage unit and index information output unit that outputs the index information that indicates the device key, as recited in claim 1.

As a result, the Examiner suggested further amending the claims in order to distinguish the claimed invention from the newly identified portions of Nakano.

## **II. Amendments to the Claims**

In view of the above, independent claims 1 and 13-15 have been amended to further distinguish the claimed invention from the newly referenced portions of the Nakano reference. Specifically, independent claims 1 and 13-15 have been amended to require that the index information output unit is operable to output, in response to the request for the index information, only the index information converted by the video processing unit.

## **III. 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection**

Claims 1-8, 10 and 13-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Nakano and Takashima. This rejection is believed clearly inapplicable to independent claims 1 and 13-15 and the claims that depend therefrom for the following reasons.

Amended independent claim 1 recites a content reproduction apparatus including an instruction receiving unit that receives an instruction for outputting index information that indicates a device key. Moreover, claim 1 recites that the content reproduction apparatus includes an index information output unit that, based on the instruction, outputs only the index information that indicates the device key and is converted by a video processing unit into a data format that is displayable on a screen of a display apparatus.

Independent claim 13 recites a related system, independent claim 14 recites a related method, and independent claim 15 recites a related computer-readable recording medium having a program recorded thereon.

Initially, Applicants note that during the above-mentioned interview, the Examiner kindly acknowledged that Nakano does not appear to disclose or suggest outputting only the index

information, because Nakano indicates that the identification information is always output along with the device key and/or the content. As a result, in view of the above-mentioned amendments to independent claims 1 and 13-15 and the above-mentioned acknowledgement by the Examiner, it is respectfully submitted that amended claims 1 and 13-15 and claims 2-8 and 10 that depend therefrom would not have been obvious or result from the any combination of Nakano and Takashima. The differences amended independent claims 1 and 13-15 and the Nakano and Takashima references are discussed below in more detail.

Specifically, Applicants note that Nakano teaches that a specific (and respective) device key corresponds to each device key identification information, and that the device key assignment unit 103 outputs (i) device keys, (ii) corresponding device key information, and (iii) corresponding device key identification information, to the corresponding user apparatus (see paragraphs [0136] and [0226], and Figs. 8 and 10).

Thus, in view of the above and as acknowledged by the Examiner, it is respectfully submitted that Nakano teaches that (i) device keys, (ii) corresponding device key information, and (iii) corresponding device key identification information, are all output to the corresponding user apparatus, but fails to disclose or suggest that the index information output unit outputs only the index information that indicates the device key and is converted by a video processing unit into a data format that is displayable on a screen of a display apparatus, as recited in claim 1.

Now turning to Takashima, Applicants note that Takashima was merely relied upon for suggesting displaying the index information on a display device. Therefore, Takashima has not been relied upon for disclosing or suggesting the above-mentioned distinguishing features recited in independent claims 1 and 13-15. Furthermore, Takashima also does not disclose or suggest, that the index information output unit outputs only the index information that indicates the

device key and is converted by a video processing unit into a data format that is displayable on a screen of a display apparatus, as recited in amended independent claim 1 and 13-15.

Therefore, because of the above-mentioned distinctions it is believed clear that independent claims 1 and 13-15 and claims 2-8 and 10 that depend therefrom would not have been obvious or result from the any combination of Nakano and Takashima.

Furthermore, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Nakano and/or Takashima or elsewhere in the prior art of record which would have caused a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Nakano and/or Takashima to obtain the invention of independent claim 1 and 13-15. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1 and 13-15 and claims 2-8 and 10 that depend therefrom are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

## **II. Conclusion**

In view of the above remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance and an early notification thereof is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Kaoru YOKOTA et al.

/Andrew L. Dunlap/

By 2009.11.09 15:18:39 -05'00'

Andrew L. Dunlap  
Registration No. 60,554  
Attorney for Applicants

ALD/led  
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
November 9, 2009